Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE pond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

	Application Number	10/665,628		
TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date	September 22, 2003		
FORM	First Named Inventor	Anthony W. James		
	Art Unit	2643		
d for all correspondence after initial filing)	Examiner Name	Melur Ramakrishnaiah		

Total Number of Pages in This Submiss		on 2 Attorney Docket Number		FOUND-0054					
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)									
Fee Transmittal Form		Drawing(s)			After Allowance Communication to TC				
. Tee Attached		Licensing-related Papers				Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences			
Amendment / Reply		Petition			Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)				
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application				Proprietary Information			
Affidavits/declaration(s) 🗆		Attorney, Revocation f Correspondence Add	ress .	Status Letter				
Extension of Time Request	, 🗆	Terminal [Disclaimer		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):				
Express Abandonment Red		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary (Supplemental); return postcard				
Information Disclosure State	tement	☐ Lan	dscape Table on CD						
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Re	marks		•					
Reply to Missing Parts/									
Incomplete Application									
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR1.52 or		•							
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT									
Firm THELEN/REID & PRIEST LLP									
Signature Mm 1									
Printed Name Marc S. Hanish									
Date	Oct	October 21, 2005 Reg. No.			42,626				
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING									
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.									
Signature Sharan & By									
Typed or printed name Sharon E. Byam				Date	October 21, 2005				

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary

Application No.: 10/665,628 First Named Applicant: Anthony W. James											
Examiner: Melur Ramakrishnaiah Art Unit: 2643 Status of Application: Pending											
Participants: (1) Examiner Melur Ramakrishnaiah (2) Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626											
(3)(4)											
Date of Interview: October 21, 2005 Time: 11:00 a.m.											
Type of Interviews (a) [X] Telephonic		(b) [] Persona	al	(c) [] Video Conference							
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO If yes, provide brief description:											
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Ar	t	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed					
(1) (2) (3) (4)	<u>Claims 1-45</u>		·	[X] [] []	[] [] []	[X] [] []					
[] Continuation Sheet Attached [] Copy of Draft Amendment (attached) Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant pointed out the fact that there was no support in Cavency given for the limitation "in response to the detecting and the authenticating. The Examiner indicated he felt this was obvious and inherent. No											
agreement was reached as to the claims. Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an											
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed be the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)											
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature) (FOUND-0054)											